

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response in reply to the Final Official Action dated August 12, 2008 and Advisory Action dated December 19, 2008. Applicant believes that the Amendment and Response is fully responsive to the Final Official Action for at least the reasons set forth herein.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 2, 11, 16, 22 and 25 have been amended herewith. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that a user input component is adapted to generate an instruction for controlling at least an operational status of the security system and generate an instruction for producing an alarm signal and the control is adapted for controlling the security system based upon the instruction from the user input component. Claim 2 has been amended to specify the security system components. Claims 11 and 16 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a remote system security control panel. Claims 22 and 25 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the security system keypad or user input components are adapted to generate an instruction for controlling at least an operational status of the security system.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of the aforementioned amendments. For example, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to paragraph 0018, 0023, and 0036. The identified sections are provided for the convenience of the Examiner and should not be taken as an exhaustive list of support.

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references. In the Final Official Action, claims 1, 4, and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pucci, U.S. Patent No. 7,064,663. Claims 1-4, and 6-27 were rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pucci in view of Wesby, or Stilp, U.S. Patent 7,019,639 (hereinafter “Stilp 639”) and Stilp, U.S. Patent No. 7,053,764 (hereinafter “Stilp 764”).

The claimed invention incorporates the locator feature into an existing **security system** without a need for additional components to generate the signals (only need tags). The advantage of the present invention is that the locator feature uses existing wireless communication components and existing transmitting and receiving protocols of the control panel and/or user interface device of the security system. In the claimed invention, the only additional items needed are the tags.

Pucci teaches a radio frequency object locator system 10 that includes a portable finder 12 and a plurality of identification tags 14.

Applicant submits that the object locator system described in Pucci is not the claimed security system. For example, the claimed system includes a keypad with input components that can provide instructions to control features of the security system, such as arm and disarm the system, as well as trip an alarm via a panic button feature, *see e.g.*, claims 1, 22 and 26.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the general purpose finder is not the claimed security system. In fact, the Examiner appears to recognize the deficiency. The Official Action states “Pucci may not disclose a security system as defined in the applicant’s specification.” *See* paragraph 4.

Similarly, Wesby, Stilp 639, and Stilp 764 fail to teach all of the limitations of the claims.

Wesby does not teach a security system keypad with user input components that are adapted to generate an instruction for controlling at least an operational status of the security system. At best, Wesby teaches a controller (in a cell phone) for locating other cell phones.

Additionally, the cited combination teaches that additional components or dedicated locator components are used. In each embodiment of both Stilp 639 and Stilp 764, a dedicated RF reader is used.

For example, both Stilp 639 and Stilp 764 teach dedicated RF readers, e.g., 200, separate from the keypad and control panel.

Stilp 639, at Fig. 3, clearly depicts a separate RFID Reader 200 and Keypad 500. *See also* Fig. 5B.

The keypad 500 can communicate with the RFID Reader 200. The RFID Readers include certain control functions. Fig. 9 illustrates an example of the RFID Reader. The reader includes RF interface, power supply, memory and a processor. The reader does not include a user interface. The Stilp 639 reference states that a keypad may be added to provide a user interface.

Stilp 764 also teaches a separate RFID Reader 200. Each RFID Reader is responsive to one RFID transponder in a room associated with the RFID reader. The keypad 320 acts as a user interface device for the user to input commands or data. The RF reader is neither the user interface device nor a security system control panel.

Therefore, the cited combination fails to teach that the user interface device, the transmitter and control are integrated in a security system keypad and that the input component

generates an instruction for controlling at least an operational status of the security system and generates an instruction for producing an alarm signal.

Applicant further submits that the cited references fail to teach a remote security system control panel (from the user interface). Stilp 764 discloses an integrated controller and keypad. Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach generating a wireless enable signal at the user interface, said wireless enable signal is encoded with the retrieved identifier, transmitting the wireless enable signal to a remote security system control panel and transmitting a wireless activation signal from the remote security system control panel, said wireless activation signal is encoded with the retrieved identifier, as recited in independent claims 11 and 16. There is no teaching of relaying the instruction through a remote security system control panel.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that each of the independent claims is patentable over the cited references based at least upon the above-identified analysis.

Applicant further submits that claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-15, 17-21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 are patentable over the cited combination based at least upon the above-identified analysis and in view of their dependency, whether directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 11, 16, 22 and 25, respectively.

In conclusion, Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application,

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Seth Weinfeld", written over a horizontal line.

Seth Weinfeld

Registration No. 50,929

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
SW:reg